



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,612	01/17/2002	Ravikumar Pisupati	100200239-1	3020

7590 02/11/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

AVELLINO, JOSEPH E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/052,612	Applicant(s) PISUPATI, RAVIKUMAR	
	Examiner Joseph E. Avellino	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers


- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/26/2004</u>.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p> |
|---|--|



DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination; claims 1 and 11 independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 5, 6, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claims 5, 6, and 15 recite limitations to the transmitted data from the email message. However, it is stated that commands or data may be transmitted (claim 4). The aforementioned claims recite limitations which are not limiting in scope since it is not necessary that the data be transmitted to the computing element. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11-12, 16, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Motoyama (USPN 5,819,110).

6. Referring to claim 1, Motoyama discloses a computer network for providing services (i.e. monitoring, controlling, and diagnosing operation of a machine, e.g. abstract), comprising:

a plurality of computing elements 26, 30, 34, (Figure 1) each of which comprises computing resources for supporting one or more services (see above);

a redirector (mail server), communicatively connected to each of said computing elements, configured to serve as an email proxy (Figure 5; col. 6, line 58 to col. 7, line 26);

wherein said services are controlled by email messages routed by said redirector among said plurality of computing elements (Figure 7; col. 6, line 58 to col. 7, line 26; col. 8, lines 11-28).

7. Referring to claim 2, Motoyama discloses each of the computing elements has a service handler (i.e. parsing process) (Figure 7; col. 7, line 62 to col. 8, line 10); and

said service handler on a computing element extracts an access function (i.e. action) from an incoming email message and complies with said extracted access function (Figure 6; col. 7, line 62 to col. 8, line 10).

Art Unit: 2143

8. Referring to claim 3, Motoyama discloses said redirection comprises a mail router (i.e. mail server) for routing email messages (col. 7, lines 27-44).

9. Referring to claim 7, Motoyama discloses comprising a mail server for receiving email and transferring email containing access functions to said redirector as proxy for said plurality of computing elements (col. 7, lines 27-44).

10. Referring to claim 8, Motoyama discloses comprising a firewall 14 (Figure 1) through which email messages are received, said redirector being protected within said firewall (Figure 1; col. 7, lines 7-45).

11. Claims 11-12, 16, 17, and 21 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above. Furthermore Motoyama discloses sending a response email message following compliance with said extracted access function (col. 8, lines 1-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2143

Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama.

13. Referring to claim 9, Motoyama discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 8. Motoyama does not specifically disclose the client is a web client within the firewall to obtain access to said services. Motoyama does disclose that the workstations in the first network 6 can include IBM PC's, UNIX machines, or Apple Macintoshes (col. 3, lines 20-25) which are well known to be able to provide email to users. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide service to a machine within the firewall in order to facilitate authentication and reduce overhead processing relating to security issues.

14. Claim 18 is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claims 4-6, 10, 13-15, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama in view of Weber et al. (USPN 6,480,901) (hereinafter Weber).

15. Referring to claim 4, Motoyama discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Motoyama does not specifically disclose the redirector comprises a service handler for extracting an access function from a message and transmitting commands or data to the computing elements. In analogous art, Weber discloses

Art Unit: 2143

another computer network for providing services wherein a redirector extracts access functions from messages and transmits commands to the elements (e.g. abstract). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Weber with Motoyama in order to allow the email clients of Motoyama to address the proxy server system of Weber in order to be able to incorporate a plurality of different devices utilizing different protocols to the network without requiring the user know beforehand what the specific form for the protocol and device in question, thereby providing a common platform for management as well as only one point wherein updates are required, thereby reducing complexity of the overall system.

16. Referring to claim 5, Motoyama discloses the data is a service (i.e. action) (Figure 7; col. 7, line 62 to col. 8, line 10).

17. Referring to claim 6, Motoyama in view of Weber disclose the invention substantively as described in claim 4. Motoyama in view of Weber further disclose the data is a specified location where a service can be accessed (Weber, col. 17, lines 53-63). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Weber with Motoyama in order to allow the email clients of Motoyama to address the proxy server system of Weber in order to be able to incorporate a plurality of different devices utilizing different protocols to the network without requiring the user know beforehand what the specific form for the protocol and

Art Unit: 2143

device in question, thereby providing a common platform for management as well as only one point wherein updates are required, thereby reducing complexity of the overall system.

18. Referring to claim 10, Motoyama discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 9. Motoyama does not specifically disclose generating web pages related to the services of the web client. In analogous art, Weber disclose the proxy server generating web pages related to the services for the client (Figure 7; col. 14, lines 23-41). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Weber with Motoyama in order to allow the email clients of Motoyama to address the proxy server system of Weber in order to be able to incorporate a plurality of different devices utilizing different protocols to the network without requiring the user know beforehand what the specific form for the protocol and device in question, thereby providing a common platform for management as well as only one point wherein updates are required, thereby reducing complexity of the overall system.

19. Claims 13-15, and 19-20 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2143


21. Blair et al. (USPN 6,182,227) discloses lightweight authentication system for validating a server access request.
22. Motoyama (US 2003/0172115) discloses diagnosing, controlling, and monitoring machines using email.
23. L'Heureux et al. (USPN 6,697,942) discloses remotely managing a remote device using an electronic mail message.
24. Watanabe et al. (USPN 6,587,647) discloses remote monitoring of image forming apparatus.
25. Inakoshi (USPN 5,933,604) discloses resource monitoring system for providing notice of changes in resources in a network.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (571) 272-3905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JEA
February 2, 2005


Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2143
William C. Vaughn, Jr.